

REMARKS

In this response, Applicants have amended claim 1, and cancelled claim 4 (claims 3 and 5-8 were withdrawn in a previous response). After entry of this paper, claims 1 and 2 are pending in this application.

Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Hezel (EP 1 129 828) in view of Iwata (U.S. Patent No. 4,840,090).

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite that "the plurality of joint arms include a joint arm having two motors for driving the first and second rotating shafts and a joint arm with no motor, wherein the joint arm with no motor is adjacently connected to the joint arm having two motors." Hezel does not disclose at least these features of claim 1. Hezel discloses a robot for coating or treating work pieces. Hezel did not recognize the need for reducing the length of a robot, and fails to teach a robot having the plurality of joint arms including a joint arm having two motors and a joint arm with no motor adjacently connected to the joint arm having two motors. Iwata, which was cited for allegedly teaching a robot actuator having a motor, a rotating shaft, and a speed reduction, fails to cure the deficiency of Hezel. Thus, there is no *prima facie* case of obviousness created by the combination of Hezel and Iwata.

Claim 2 is dependent from claim 1; and thus, claim 2 is patentable for at least the same reasons as set forth above in connection with independent claim 1.

Claims 1, 2 and 4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Hezel or Larsson (USP 4,904,148) in view of Akeel (USP 5,293,107).

As discussed above, claim 1 has been amended to recite “the plurality of joint arms include a joint arm having two motors for driving the first and second rotating shafts and a joint arm with no motor, wherein the joint arm with no motor is adjacently connected to the joint arm having two motors.” In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that Hezel and Larsson disclose a rotation axis of joint arms being inclined relative to one another, but admitted that neither Hezel nor Larsson teaches joint arms having two motors for driving the first and second rotating shafts and joint arms with no motor being alternately connected (as recited in original claim 4). However, the Examiner took the position that Akeel teaches positioning arms with a pair of motors and arms with no motor in an alternate manner, and the combination of either Hezel or Larsson with Akeel would render claim 4 obvious. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s conclusion.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted “motivation [to combine the prior art references] being to provide a compact arrangement while facilitation in the assembly of the device.” The Office Action does not specify where the Examiner found such a motivation in the prior art references. The Office Action merely states a conclusory statement that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the cited references, providing no specific reasons. As provided by MPEP § 2141, “[t]he key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious,” and “[s]uch analysis should be made explicit and cannot be premised upon mere conclusory statements.” Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action fails to articulate the reasons why

the claimed invention would have been obvious, and a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established for the original claim 4, or for amended claim 1.

Claim 2 is dependent from claim 1. Thus, claim 2 is patentable for at least the same reasons as set forth above in connection with independent claim 1.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: January 18, 2008

By: 
Jin Zhang
L.R. No. L0223
Direct: (650) 849-6677

Filed Via - EFS WEB